

Appl. No. 09/228,710  
Reply to Office Action

PATENT

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-28 were pending and were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious by Pickett in view of Hall, and in further view of Amoni.

In light of the amendments and the following remarks, the undersigned requests withdrawal of the rejections.

#### I. The Present Invention

In the embodiment in Fig. 2, telephones 260 are connected by telephone lines 250 to server 70. Further, as seen, two telephones 260 are not connected to a common telephone line.




FIG. 2

This feature is now more accurately reflected in the amended claims. As an example, claim 1, now recites in part, "wherein none of the telephones are on a common line."

#### II. The Cited References

##### A. Pickett

The Examiner previously agreed that Pickett did not disclose ringing less than all the telephones at a time or that all of the telephones are on separate circuits. (Paper 18 at p. 3).

##### B. Hall

The Examiner previously cited "party lines" as the "relevant" portion of Hall. Additionally, the Examiner interpreted the term "party line" as: "in party lines although there is a common line, but each telephone is actually connected by a separate circuit with separate telephone line." (Paper 21 at p. 18.)

Appl. No. 09/228,710  
Reply to Office Action

PATENT

### III. The Cited References Distinguished

In light of the amendments to the claims, the cited references in combination, do not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly the obviousness rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites "wherein none of the telephones are on a common line." In contrast, The Examiner interprets Hall as disclosing party lines where, all of the telephones are on a common line. In light of this interpretation, Hall does not teach the claimed limitation. Accordingly Claim 1 is asserted to be allowable.

Claims 2-8, dependent on claim 1, are asserted to be allowable for the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, and more specifically, for the additional limitations they recite.

Claim 9 is asserted to be allowable for the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, and more specifically, for the additional limitations it recites.

Claims 10-17, dependent on claim 9, are asserted to be allowable for the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, and more specifically, for the additional limitations they recite.

Claim 18 is asserted to be allowable for the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, and more specifically, for the additional limitations it recites.


Claims 19-28, dependent on claim 18, are asserted to be allowable for the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, and more specifically, for the additional limitations they recite.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephen Y. Pang

  
Reg. No. 38,875

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SYP:CCL:vap